

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Claim 1 and 13 are amended. Claim 14 is cancelled. Claim 24 is newly added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13, 15, 17-19 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0028811 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 stands amended. Walker is directed to a fingerprint recognition system. Walker does not disclose or suggest encryption of information within the intermediate steps of fingerprint recognition process (see Fig. 4). Applicant's invention provides security against malicious intruders from taking control of the authentication system by attacking the intermediate stages of fingerprint recognition. Unlike Walker's disclosure, the amended claim 13 thus includes the recitation, "...securely communicating between a fingerprint matching module interfaced to an authorization module that is interfaced to a resource access module for performing said step of using said fingerprint". Walker fails to disclose any such internal encryption to secure the fingerprint matching process. This renders Walker's system open to the dangers of intruders who are able to access the system at an intermediate stage of authentication process. Hence, Walker does not disclose each and every element of the amended claim 13. Therefore, Walker does not anticipate claim 13. Hence, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 13 and allow the same.

Claims 15, 17-19 and 21-23 depend on claim 13 and hence are allowable for at least the same reason(s) as claim 13.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker (U.S. Pub. No. 20030028811 A1) in view of Felsher (U.S. Pub. No. 20020010679 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 stands amended. Claim 14 is cancelled.

Walker as discussed above does not disclose internal encryption of the fingerprint based authentication process. Felsher is directed to an electronic medical records management system. Felsher suggests that medicals records stored in a database can be encrypted when the records are being transmitted over a network to a recipient, Page 36, paragraph [0252]. However, Felscher's encryption is directed to encrypting medical records that are transmitted over a network. The applicant's invention uses a encryption to secure the interfaces between various modules involved in the fingerprint authentication process. Applicant's invention and Felscher apply different kinds of encryption system to different kinds of problems. To contrast, Felsher's requires only the transmission from database to recipient of the medical record to be encrypted, while in the present invention the multiple module interfaces of the authentication mechanism are encrypted.

As amended the claim 1 includes a recitation, "...said access mechanism including at least one fingerprint matching module having a first secure interface to said fingerprint device and at least one authorization module having a second secure interface to said fingerprint matching module and a third secure interface to at least one

resource access module". Neither Walker nor Felsher suggest an access mechanism that includes an authorization module, fingerprint matching module and resource access module that have secure interfaces. Hence, Walker and Felsher cannot be combined to render claim 1 as obvious. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and allow the same.

Claims 2-12 depend on claim 1 and hence are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1. A recitation similar to that included in the amended claim 1 and discussed above is also included in the amended claim 13. Claims 16 and 20 depend on claim 13, and hence are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 10, 2003

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/HBS